DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 825 52 LI 003 322

AUTHOR	De Lanoy, Diana D.; Cuadra, Carlos A.
TITLE	Phase I Final Report on Study of Academic Library Consortia.
INSTITUTION	System Development Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	TM-4597-002-00
BUREAU NO	BR-0-9002
PUB DATE	Oct 71
CONTRACT	OEC-0-70-2846
NOTE	27p.; (1 Reference)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Libraries; *Consortia; *Library Cooperation; *Library Services; Library Surveys; Questionnaires; Shared Services; Task Analysis; *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

Phase I involves two questionnaire surveys aimed at identifying all academic library consortia in higher education and, within this univerise, providing a list of participating libraries and services. The major product of this phase is a "Directory of Academic Library Consortia." The descriptions of the individual tasks outlined in this Phase I report are: (1) initial planning, (2) developing the survey plan, (3) developing the survey instruments, (4) making other survey preparations, (5) mailing of questionnaire 1, (6) follow-up of questionnaire 1, (7) mailing of questionnaire 2, (8) follow-up of questionnaire 2, (9) inspection and preparation for analysis, (10) analysis, (11) confirming directory content and form and (12) preparation of directory. (MM)

ED057825

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TM-4597/002/00

BR-0-9002
PA-52

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

(TM Series)

This document was produced by SDC in performance of contract OEC-0-70-2846

PHASE I FINAL REPORT ON STUDY OF ACADEMIC LIBRARY CONSORTIA

DIANA D. DE LANOY
AND
CARLOS A. CUADRA

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
2500 COLORADO AVE.
SANTA MONICA
CALIFORNIA
90406

October 1971

The views, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of agencies of the United States Government.

Although this document contains no classified information it has not been cleared for open publication by the Department of Defense. Open publication, wholly or in part, is prohibited without the prior approval of the System Development Corporation.

LI 003 322

1159 4/65

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1. INTRODUCTION 3

2. DESCRIPTION OF INDIVIDUAL TASKS. 4

DATA COLLECTION

2.1 TASK 1: INITIAL PLANNING 4

2.2 TASK 2: DEVELOPING THE SURVEY PLAN 4

2.3 TASK 3: DEVELOPING THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS. 7

2.4 TASK 4: MAKING OTHER SURVEY PREPARATIONS 9

2.5 TASK 5: MAILING OF QUESTIONNAIRE 1 10

2.6 TASK 6: FOLLOW-UP OF QUESTIONNAIRE 1 10

2.7 TASK 7: MAILING OF QUESTIONNAIRE 2 11

2.8 TASK 8: FOLLOW-UP OF QUESTIONNAIRE 2 11

DATA ORGANIZATION AND ANALYSIS

2.9 TASK 9: INSPECTION AND PREPARATION FOR ANALYSIS. 16

2.10 TASK 10: ANALYSIS. 16

PREPARATION OF DIRECTORY

2.11 TASK 11: CONFIRMING DIRECTORY CONTENT AND FORM 21

2.12 TASK 12: PREPARATION OF DIRECTORY. 21

3. LIAISON WITH THE LIBRARY COMMUNITY 22

4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER MATTERS

4.1 ADHERENCE TO PROJECT PLAN AND SCHEDULE. 22

4.2 PROJECT PERSONNEL 26

LIST OF FIGURES

PAGE

Figure 1. Revised Schedule for SDC Study of Academic Library Consortia. 5

Figure 2. Q1 Questionnaire. 12

Figure 3. Q2 Cover Letter (Groups With Headquarters). 13

Figure 4. Q2 Cover Letter (Groups Without Headquarters) 14

Figure 5. Q2 Follow-up Letter 17

Figure 6. State Librarian Letter. 18

Figure 7. Draft Consortium Entry Cover Letter 23

Figure 8. Consortium Entry Checklist. 24

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Q1 Survey Summary 10

Table 2. Q2 Survey Summary 15

Table 3. Ranked Reasons for Consortium Nonmembership 19

Table 4. Ranked Services Desired from Consortium Membership. . 20

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the final report on Phase I of a study of library consortia in higher education conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC). This report, which covers Phase I activities during the period 1 August 1970 to 17 September 1971, is the third in a series of four formal reports:

Progress Report on Phase I (TM-4597/000/00); submitted to USOE on 10 August 1970.

Progress Report on Phase II (TM-4597/001/00); submitted to USOE on 5 August 1971.

Final Report on Phase I (TM-4597/002/00--this document); accompanied by Directory of Academic Library Consortia (TM-4597/003/00).

Final Report on Phase II (TM-4597/004/00); to include the model and guidelines for consortium development.

This report supplements and supersedes both previously submitted project progress reports. Refer to the Phase I Progress Report for details of early project activities and to the Phase II Progress Report for case-study activities and a review of survey questionnaires.

Phase I has involved two questionnaire surveys aimed at identifying all academic library consortia in higher education and, within this universe, providing a list of participating libraries and services. The major product of this phase, submitted under separate cover with this report, is a Directory of Academic Library Consortia.

Phase II, currently nearing completion, involves a case-study analysis of 15 selected academic library consortia; the major product will be a guidelines document to help libraries plan, develop, and operate library services cooperatively. This document will outline several basic models of library consortia

in higher education and will provide guidelines for planning, developing, operating, and evaluating library consortia. The data will be based on findings from both the questionnaire surveys and the case-study analyses.

2. DESCRIPTION OF INDIVIDUAL TASKS

2.1 TASK 1: INITIAL PLANNING

The proposed plan of work as submitted by SDC was formally put into operation on 15 March 1970. The initial project schedule, outlining the tasks to be performed and the time frames, was agreed upon. However, the project schedule was formally revised during the course of Phase I due to a delay of several months in obtaining forms approval through the Office of Management Budget (OMB). The revised schedule for project activities is presented in Figure 1.

To activate the project, an initial planning meeting was held between Carlos Cuadra, Project Head, and Katharine Stokes and Kathleen Molz. Among the topics discussed at the initial meeting were appropriate publicity releases. On 25 March, letters announcing the study and enclosing a copy of the Publicity Release were sent to the Association of American Universities, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of American Colleges, and the Association of Research Libraries.

The remaining part of the initial planning task involved assembling an extensive reference collection and bibliography on academic consortia, library networking, and other library cooperative arrangements. The full bibliography will be included as part of the Phase II Final Report.

2.2 TASK 2: DEVELOPING THE SURVEY PLAN

Of the approximately 2600 institutions of higher learning in the U.S.,[1] over 120 were estimated to have libraries that are members of consortia. To identify

[1] Raymond S. Moore, Consortiums in American Higher Education; 1965-66; Report of an Exploratory Study, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968, pp. 2, 8.

TASKS	1971 Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct
Data Collection									
5. Mail Q1	—								
6. Follow-up of Q1		—							
7. Mail Q2			—	—					
8. Follow-up of Q2 (includes telephone follow-up)			—	—	—				
Data Organization and Analysis									
9. Inspection and Preparation for Machine Input			—	—	—				
10. Keyboarding				—	—				
11. Analysis					—	—			
Preparation of Directory									
12. Confirm Content and Form					—	—			
13. Prepare Directory						—	—	▲ Final Report Phase I	
1. Case-Study Data Collection					—	—	—		
2. Case-Study Reporting					—	—	—		
3. Description of Consortium Characteristics						—	—	—	—
4. Development of Model and Guidelines							—	—	—
5. Preparation of Final Report									—
							▲ Progress Report Phase II		▲ Final Report Phase II

Scheduled ——

Note: Project began 15 March 1970. Tasks completed prior to this revision and not reflected on this schedule are:

Initial Planning
Developing the Survey Plan
Developing the Survey Instruments
Developing the Site Visit Checklist

Figure 1. Revised Schedule for SDC Study of Academic Library Consortia

these libraries and consortia, it was decided to carry out the survey in two steps: 1) identify libraries that are members of a consortium, and 2) obtain detailed information from each consortium headquarters or lead member library.

The plan for developing and obtaining clearance on the survey instruments called for the following five steps:

1. Develop a brief questionnaire for libraries (Questionnaire 1), together with a cover letter and follow-up cover letter.
2. Pretest Questionnaire 1.
3. Develop "survey justification" package necessary for USOE and Office of Management Budget (OMB) review, and submit the package (and Questionnaire 1) to USOE.
4. Develop the questionnaire for library consortia (Questionnaire 2), together with a cover letter and follow-up cover letter.
5. Develop the survey justification package for Questionnaire 2 and submit it to USOE.

The reason for the separate submission of the two questionnaires (and survey justification packages) was to permit mailout of Questionnaire 1 as soon as possible, and to permit development of Questionnaire 2 while the Questionnaire 1 package was under review by USOE and OMB. However, it was deemed advisable by USOE to submit only one complete survey justification package containing both questionnaires and supporting materials. Accordingly, the project plan was revised to accommodate this guidance. The single survey justification package was completed in July 1970 and formally submitted to USOE for USOE OMB approval. After a considerable delay, approval was granted in early February 1971.

2.3 TASK 3: DEVELOPING THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

The development of the survey instruments involved a number of interdependent activities, such as identifying the subject matter to be covered, formulating and sequencing questions, pretesting and consultation, and review and revision. A summary of these subtasks follows.

1. Identifying the subject matter to be covered. The subject matter for Questionnaire 1 (hereafter Q1) was relatively easy to define, since its major purpose was simply to identify existing library consortia. However, questions were added to provide other information that would be helpful to the project team in understanding attitudes toward consortium participation and particular areas of consortium attractiveness. Another question was included to permit USOE to update the Directory at a later time without a massive resurvey: It is now possible to survey only those libraries that were not consortium members at the time of the present survey but expressed an intent to become consortium members in the fairly near future.

   Identifying the subject matter to be covered in Questionnaire 2 (hereafter Q2) was considerably more difficult, since the range of cooperative library arrangements and activities is wide, and numerous considerations are worthy of exploration. The project staff identified several major areas of interest and then, within each area of interest, pinpointed the kinds of information that appeared potentially most valuable in terms of the objectives of developing (1) the Directory and (2) the guidelines to consortium development. The major areas were:

   Library Consortium Objectives and Activities
   Financial Planning
   Management and Staffing
   Facilities
   Problem-Solving and Evaluative Techniques

2. Formulating and sequencing the questions. As topics and questions were developed, each was examined from the standpoint of feasibility of inclusion in a questionnaire (as opposed to an interview situation), as well as from the standpoint of relative importance or criticality. Our intent was that the questionnaire should require no more than an hour to complete; thus it became necessary not only to streamline individual questions as much as possible, but also to confine ourselves to the most critically important questions.

   After the initial list of questions was developed, the questions were sequenced for ease and convenience of answering, and both questionnaires were formatted to the extent necessary for pretesting. No particular problems were involved in this activity. It should be noted that Q2 involved two parts: Part I was intended to gather information for the Directory, and was so identified to the respondent; Part II was intended to gather background and supporting information of a less quantitative--and somewhat more sensitive--nature. The respondents were told clearly that none of the latter information would be quoted or used in reports without their express permission.

3. Pretesting and consultation. All survey instruments require one or more rounds of pretesting. The initial round of pretesting was done by project members and was concerned primarily with ensuring clarity of expression and clarity in directing the kind of response required. Q1 was then sent to 10 persons who had agreed either to fill out (pretest it) or review it and offer comments; Q2 was sent to 14 persons, some of whom also reviewed Q1.[1] All of the reviewers but one were professional librarians; six were directors of consortia.

   The pretesting and consultation began on 11 June 1970, and were completed on 17 July 1970.

[1]The total number of actual pretests was within the number allowed by Bureau of the Budget regulations regarding prior approval of questionnaires.

4. Review and revision. A number of very helpful comments, suggestions, and criticisms were obtained from the pretesting and consultation, all of which were given careful consideration in revising Q1 and Q2. Some questions that were too complex for questionnaire administration were dropped; others were revised for clarity or to take into account some of the complexities of consortium development or operation that made it difficult for particular consortium directors to respond.

   All of the pretesters and consultants were thanked by letter or by telephone for their assistance.

   In addition to the help from the pretesters and consultants, the project staff also received advice and assistance from the USOE project monitor and several other USOE staff members, at meetings on 15 and 16 June 1970. This feedback was also incorporated into the revisions of Q1 and Q2.

2.4 TASK 4: MAKING OTHER SURVEY PREPARATIONS

This task involved three activities: (1) obtaining clearance and approval for the survey instruments, (2) identifying the addresses for Q1, and (3) making preliminary preparations for printing the questionnaire.

One or both questionnaire concurrence packages were submitted to USOE during 1970 on 13 April, 8 June, 4 August, 11 September, and 19 November; the first questionnaire received formal approval on 8 February 1971 and the second on 18 March 1971.

In accordance with suggestions from the USOE project monitor, the initial mailing list for Q2 was originally to be obtained from the National Center for Educational Statistics. A request for permission to use this mailing list (or to obtain preaddressed labels) was submitted on 27 May 1970. A subsequent

telephone conversation indicated that SDC would be given the opportunity to copy the tape containing this list. However, upon receipt of the tape, the data were in such a highly coded format that it was decided, instead of writing a program, to purchase two lists from the R.R. Bowker Company--one for initial mailing and one for follow-up.

2.5 TASK 5: MAILING OF QUESTIONNAIRE 1

The 2600 Q1s were mailed on 19 February 1971. During the four weeks following the initial Q1 mailing, approximately 1000 returns were received.

2.6 TASK 6: FOLLOW-UP OF QUESTIONNAIRE 1

A follow-up mailing, sent to the 1600 colleges and universities who had not responded, resulted in an additional 516 answered responses. It is interesting to note that a considerable number of questionnaires were returned unanswered due to the closing of the institution. Table 1 summarizes the first survey; further statistics gleaned from the questionnaires are presented in section 2.10.

Table 1. Q1 Survey Summary

	Number	Percent of Total Mailing
Q1's sent out	2600	100
Returns from first mailing	1000	38
Follow-up letters sent	1600	62
Total Returns	1516	58
	Number	**Percent of Total Returns**
Returns reflecting consortia membership	698	46
Returns reflecting nonmembership	783	52
Returns with insufficient data to identify	35	2

2.7 TASK 7: MAILING OF QUESTIONNAIRE 2

This task involved compiling the respondents from the first questionnaires into a preliminary list of consortia. To accomplish this, the following procedures were employed:

1. The Yes's to question 1 (see Figure 2) were separated from the No's.
2. The consortia name and/or mailing address from question 2 were added (if new) or tallied (if already present) into a card file.
3. For groups without headquarters, the respondent's name and address were added to the list.

The initial list consisted of approximately 450 entries. It was possible, at this point, to rule out entries that did not meet the requirements for inclusion as academic library consortia. Examples are cooperatives within single institutions, such as the nine-campus system development activity at the University of California, and associations, such as ALA and SLA. Without more information as to membership and activities for the 409 remaining groups, it was difficult to determine whether a given group fell within the defined scope of the study. To ensure that all bona fide consortia would be included in the second survey, the second questionnaire was sent to each of the 409 groups. In addition, one type of letter was prepared for groups with headquarters (Figure 3) and another for groups without headquarters (Figure 4). Each form letter was personalized using the IBM MT/ST, and each questionnaire was given a number to correspond with its position in the mailing list for each in checking off responses. Table 2 summarizes the second survey.

2.8 TASK 8: FOLLOW-UP OF QUESTIONNAIRE 2

The first questionnaire survey was characterized by rapid and complete responses. Conversely, administration of the second questionnaire required

FORM APPROVED: OMB NO. 51-S-70041
APPROVED THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 1971

National Survey of Library Consortia in Higher Education

(Sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Instructions

For the purpose of this survey, an academic library consortium will be defined as: an association of two or more libraries of autonomous, degree-granting educational institutions, established to pursue, between or among them, a program to broaden services, increase the availability of library resources, secure economics of operation, or achieve other agreed-upon goals. Such associations may be either formal or informal, and may or may not be limited to library activities. We are interested in all cooperative efforts involving libraries, with the exception of traditional interlibrary loan arrangements. If your cooperation with other libraries is limited to such interlibrary loans, you would not be considered a member of a consortium, as defined here.

Please answer the questions below and return this questionnaire as soon as possible. Simply fold it so that the address is visible; then staple and mail. No postage is required. Thank you.

---

1. Does your library participate in one or more consortia (in the sense defined above)?

Yes (____) ▼ Please answer Questions 2 and 3. (Skip Questions 4, 5, and 6.)

No (____) ▼ Please answer only Questions 4, 5, and 6. (Skip Questions 2 and 3.)

2. Please give the name and headquarters (or information source) mailing address of each consortium to which you belong:

(1)_____

_____

(2)_____

_____

(3)_____

_____

(4)_____

_____

3. If you belong to a consortium for which there is no headquarters (or information source), please list the names of the other participating libraries:

_____

_____

_____

_____

(Enclose additional sheet if necessary.)

Figure 2. Portion of First Page, Q1 Questionnaire

NATIONAL SURVEY OF LIBRARY CONSORTIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION
(SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE)

Dear

System Development Corporation is under contract with the U.S. Office of Education (Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology) to develop a directory of library components in consortia in American higher education, and to prepare detailed guidelines for the effective planning, development, and operation of library consortia.

Through the use of an earlier questionnaire directed to individual academic libraries, we have identified the library group you represent as a consortium. The questionnaire accompanying this letter is intended to provide sufficient information for us to (1) describe your consortium in the planned directory (see the attached sample entry), and (2) to understand its operations, in comparison with those of other consortia so as to be able to help improve the services that library consortia deliver to the ultimate users of the libraries: faculty, staff, and students. Both the Directory and guidelines document will become publicly available.

There are two parts to the questionnaire. Part I will provide information for the Directory of Academic Library Consortia. Part II solicits background information, which will be used for the guidelines document.

Completing the questionnaire should take no more than one hour of your time; it can be returned in the prepared, self-addressed envelope. We earnestly solicit your help so that the project can provide academic libraries with two very useful new information resources.

Thank you for your cooperation. We hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Carlos A. Cuadra, Project Director
(Manager, Education and Library
Systems Department)
System Development Corporation
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406

CAC:lee
Enclosure

Figure 3. Q2 Cover Letter (Groups With Headquarters)

NATIONAL SURVEY OF LIBRARY CONSORTIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION
(SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE)

Dear

System Development Corporation is under contract with the U.S. Office of Education (Bureau of Libraries and Fducational Technology) to develop a directory of library components in consortia in American higher education, and to prepare detailed guidelines for the effective planning, development, and operation of library consortia.

Through your response to an earlier questionnaire directed to individual academic libraries, we have identified the library group you are a member of as a consortium without headquarters. The questionnaire accompanying this letter is intended to provide sufficient information for us to (1) describe your consortium in the planned directory (see the attached sample entry), and (2) to understand its operations, in comparison with those of other consortia so as to be able to help improve the services that library consortia deliver to the ultimate users of the libraries: faculty, staff, and students. Both the Directory and guidelines document will become publicly available.

There are two parts to the questionnaire. Part I will provide information for the Directory of Academic Library Consortia. Part II solicits background information, which will be used for the guidelines document.

Completing the questionnaire should take no more than one hour of your time; it can be returned in the prepared, self-addressed envelope. We earnestly solicit your help so that the project can provide academic libraries with two very useful new information resources. If you think another representative of your consortium should complete the questionnaire, or that it should be a joint effort among the group, would you please route it as appropriate?

Sincerely,

Carlos A. Cuadra, Project Director
(Manager, Education and Library
Systems Department)
System Development Corporation
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406

CAC:lee
Enclosure

Figure 4. Q2 Cover Letter
(Groups Without Headquarters)

Table 2. Q2 Survey Summary

Q2's sent out.		409
Total returns.		173
Directory entries.		125
Q2 recipients not included as directory entries* . . .		284
Recipients indicated by letter that they were not academic library consortia.	96	
Recipients returned questionnaires indicating they were outside the scope of the study.	48	
Further follow-up (letters or phone calls) indicated recipients were outside the scope of the study	140	
	284	

*It is interesting to note that of the 261 cooperatives not included in the directory, about two-thirds were libraries in informal cooperation that did not have activities beyond traditional interlibrary loan or that were too early in the development stages to consider themselves consortia. The other one-third were cooperatives or associations that included a variety of other than academic library memberships.

multiple follow-ups to respondents who failed to complete and return questionnaires from the first mailing, and also to many respondents who provided incomplete information. An example of the follow-up letter appears in Figure 5. In order to ensure a complete and correct directory, phone calls were made to all respondents who did not respond to the follow-up.

In order to ensure that the study would include all academic library consortia in the U.S., we sent a letter to each state librarian (Figure 6), listing the groups reported as headquartered in his state and asking him to indicate any that were missing. Most of the state librarians returned our lists, confirming that they were complete; a few provided more detailed name and/or address information, and five additional consortia were identified. Completion of the follow-up activity for the second questionnaire required all of May, June, and July 1971.

2.9 TASK 9: INSPECTION AND PREPARATION FOR ANALYSIS

It was initially planned to encode and keyboard the returned questionnaires for computer-based data analysis. However, review of the returns indicated that many of the responses were not readily adaptable to keyboarding, and it was therefore decided to conduct the analysis manually. The results appear in the Directory statistical tables and in the Phase II Final Report.

Statistical data appropriate to the discussion of consortium characteristics will appear in the Phase II Final Report; for each major consortium characteristic, a one- or two-level frequency analysis will indicate the number of consortia meeting the various criteria presented.

2.10 TASK 10: ANALYSIS

Since the majority of comparative statistics from the Q2's are being used in the tasks in Phase II, we plan to illustrate them in full in the Phase II Final Report and in the Model and Guidelines for Consortium Development,

NATIONAL SURVEY OF LIBRARY CONSORTIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION
(SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE)

Dear

Several weeks ago, we mailed you a questionnaire designed to help us obtain data about the consortium headquartered at your institution. To date, we have not heard from you.

As we indicated in our earlier communication, the study is being carried out under contract with the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology. Its purposes are to develop a directory of library consortia in higher education, and to prepare detailed experience-based guidelines on consortium development. We believe that these tools will be very valuable to institutions of higher education and their libraries.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire we sent to you earlier, please accept our thanks, as well as our apologies for writing to you again. If you have not returned the questionnaire, won't you please take the time to help us? A sample directory entry is enclosed.

Thank you for your cooperation. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Carlos A. Cuadra, Project Director
(Manager, Education and Library
Systems Department)
System Development Corporation
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406

CAC:lee
Enclosure

Figure 5. Q2 Follow-up Letter

NATIONAL SURVEY OF LIBRARY CONSORTIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION
(SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE)

Dear

System Development Corporation is under contract with the U.S. Office of Education (Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology) to develop a directory of library components in consortia in American higher education, and to prepare detailed guidelines for the effective planning, development, and operation of library consortia.

Through the use of a questionnaire directed to individual academic libraries, we have identified the consortia listed on the attached sheet as being headquartered in your state. Each of these groups has been sent a questionnaire designed, among other things, to provide input to the directory. As returns come back to us we are finding out which ones are not bona fide academic library consortia--for example, those without a preponderance of academic members.

Our concern in contacting you is to find out if there are any academic library consortia headquartered in your state which are absent from the list. If you know of any, would you please list the consortia names and addresses so we can include them in our survey. A prepared, self-addressed envelope is enclosed.

Thank you for your cooperation. We hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Diana D. DeLanoy
(Assistant Project Director for
Academic Library Consortia Project)
Education and Library Systems Department
System Development Corporation
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406

DDD:pg
Attachment

Figure 6. State Librarian Letter

as needed. Other statistical data of interest to the project and included in this section are (1) ranked reasons for consortium nonmembership, and (2) a comparative ranking by both consortia members and nonmembers of the services they would want from consortium membership.

Of the 726 Q1 respondents who did not belong to a consortium, 216 communicated reasons for nonmembership shown in Table 3. In addition, 20 to 30 reasons were given that indicated the need for development guidelines. These were primarily concerned with difficulties in gaining higher-level approval to join a consortium, problems in arriving at a cooperative agreement with other libraries, and inability to contribute staff resources to cooperative ventures.

Table 3. Ranked Reasons for Consortium Nonmembership

Reason	No. of Respondents
Lack of need	58
Costs prohibitive	36
Administrative difficulties preclude development	33
Membership currently being planned	27
Membership never proposed	18
Ineligible for Federal or state funding	19
Poor performance of other consortia	16
Unable to obtain funding	9

Both consortia members and nonmembers answered the question dealing with services desired from consortium membership. From their responses, we prepared a ranking of most-desired to least-desired services (1-19), with 1 indicating the most-desired service. The results of this ranking are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Ranked Services Desired from Consortium Membership

Services	Ranking in Order of Desirability	
	To Members	To Nonmembers
Acquisitions	4	5
Cataloging services	2	7
Reference services	6	8
Delivery services	16	15
Photocopying service	9	9
Microfilming	7	11
Production and maintenance of union lists and directories	3	2
Storage of little-used materials	10	12
Operation of a bibliographic center	19	14
Clearinghouse (e.g., for gifts, exchanges, or language translations)	12	3
Bindery service	15	18
Reciprocal borrowing privileges	1	1
Unrestricted interlibrary loans	5	4
Joint research projects (e.g., automation)	14	13
Publication program (e.g., bibliography of special collection)	17	17
Special communications services (e.g, Teletype, telefacsimile, or Tel-Autograph)	8	6
Personnel training and upgrading	13	16
Recruitment programs	18	19
User orientation programs	11	10

2.11 TASK 11: CONFIRMING DIRECTORY CONTENT AND FORM

During the preparation of the forms justification package for OMB, a preliminary Directory format was designed. After reviewing the first Q2 returns, the following minor changes were made to the format:

- Inclusion of the Higher Education Consortium to which the library consortium belongs as part of the heading, where applicable.
- Omission of the name of the library and city from the PARTICIPATING LIBRARIES AND YEAR JOINED section, since those elements of data were not communicated on the questionnaires.
- Use of bullets (•) in the PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES section for highlighting multiple objectives.
- Change of the section heading USERS to SPECIAL SERVICES for communicating both the services performed and the users serviced.
- Under STAFFING, indication of explicit number of personnel types only where there is more than one.
- Change of DIRECTOR OR PERSON TO CONTACT heading to INFORMATION SOURCE, thus communicating the person's title within the section and his address, if there is no headquarters.

After determining the scope of these format changes, a Directory entry was prepared from one of the first questionnaire returns and was submitted to USOE in May 1971 for final approval. Approval was granted and directory production began.

2.12 TASK 12: PREPARATION OF DIRECTORY

In May we conducted an analysis to determine whether to prepare the Directory manually or to employ the IBM MT/ST (Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter). In anticipation of partial corrections to many of the entries, we decided to

employ the MT/ST. This production method has proved most satisfactory, and has enabled us to accept and process changes to the Directory up to the week of production.

In preparing the Directory, each entry was first edited for completeness and then keyboarded directly from the questionnaire. The keyboarded entry was then played back and edited, and any further changes made. A final draft was then played back and sent to the consortium that contributed the data. An accompanying letter and checklist (Figures 7 and 8) asked for a review and for any items needed for the Directory that had not been communicated in the questionnaires. Ninety percent of the consortia in the Directory responded with updated drafts and/or the missing information. Any further questions were resolved with follow-up phone calls, and the Directory indexes and statistical tables were compiled from the completed entries.

3. LIAISON WITH THE LIBRARY COMMUNITY

Throughout the project we have had numerous requests for information about the scope of work being performed and results of the analysis being conducted. We have answered every letter and have endeavored to reply with all the information requested. In addition, through correspondence with state librarians and the various consortia being studied, project activities have been made known to all who have inquired.

Many persons have requested copies of the Directory. For that reason, after conferring with USOE, it was decided to obtain a commercial publisher so that the Directory would be made widely available. Publishers are now being contacted and one will be selected during the next several weeks.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER MATTERS

4.1 ADHERENCE TO PROJECT PLAN AND SCHEDULE

As mentioned in the Phase II Progress Report, the project end date was officially revised from 31 July 1971 to 31 October 1971 because of the delay in

NATIONAL SURVEY OF LIBRARY CONSORTIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION
(SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE)

Our office has recently received and processed your completed questionnaire for the National Survey of Library Consortia in Higher Education. We greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

Attached is a draft of your consortium entry for the Directory of Academic Library Consortia. Also attached is a checklist that indicates items missing from the questionnaire that are needed in order to complete your directory entry. We would appreciate it if you would:

- Review the draft of your entry and make any changes that you consider appropriate.
- Fill in the missing items on the checklist, and
- Mail the draft and completed checklist back to our office in the enclosed prepared self-addressed envelope.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Diana D DeLanoy

(Miss) Diana D. DeLanoy
(Assistant Project Director for
Academic Library Consortia Project)
Education and Library Systems Department
System Development Corporation
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406

DDD:mh
Attachment

Figure 7. Draft Consortium Entry Cover Letter

___ Informal name of the library consortium.

_____

___ Year the library consortium was founded. _____

___ Name of the multipurpose higher education consortium to which the library consortium belongs.

_____

___ Area served (Region of, State of, City of).

_____

___ List of participating members and year joined.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

___ Statement of the purposes of the library consortium.

_____

_____

_____

___ List of current activities.

_____

_____

_____

___ List of activities being planned or developed.

_____

_____

___ If the library consortium offers services to users other than the member libraries, please list the services below.

_____

_____

Figure 8. Consortium Entry Checklist

___ List of different types of staff members and their full-time equivalents (excluding regular staff of the member libraries).

_____

_____

___ Annual budget of the library consortium and the source of funding.

_____

___ Name of advisory board or committee for the library consortium and frequency of meetings.

_____

___ Full title(s), type, and frequency of publication(s).

_____

_____

___ Address of headquarters.

_____

___ Phone number of headquarters.

_____

___ Name of individual given as information source.

_____

___ Address of information source.

_____

___ Phone number of information source.

_____

___ Please submit the entire questionnaire rather than the directory entry or descriptive letter you have sent us.

Figure 8. Consortium Entry Checklist (Cont'd)

obtaining approval for the questionnaires and survey plans. In spite of the delay and the length of time needed for administration of the second survey, the project has maintained continuity and is proceeding to completion approximately on schedule.

4.2 PROJECT PERSONNEL

The Director of the project is Dr. Carlos Cuadra, Manager of the Education and Library Systems Department, SDC. Other project personnel are Miss Diana DeLanoy, Assistant Project Director, who has been responsible for day-to-day project activities; Mr. Donald Black, who has been involved in all phases of the work; Miss Maija Harrell, Mrs. Kean Mantius, and Miss Joan Meinken, who compiled and edited the Directory; Dr. Robert Katter, Mrs. Ann Luke, and Mr. Karl Pearson, who were instrumental in the development of the survey plan, the two questionnaires and the survey justification package for OMB, and in analysis of the questionnaire data; and Miss Ruth Patrick, who compiled the Phase I bibliography and has major responsibility for the field interviews and the guidelines development in Phase II of the project.